

Minutes
Pittsboro CTP Kick-Off Meeting
July 22, 2010

scott--pre kick off ctp meeting. sign in sheets going around.

will--ctp overview; we will go over tasks, schedule, consensus, etc; multi-modal focus (compared to the old t'fare plans). Some tie in with multimodal for this plan, but this study will focus mainly on highway elements.

showed MPO/RPO boundaries; noted DCHC boundary has changed since map was made

Scott--I will pass around the map for Harnett County as example [maps passed around]

Will--the main benefit is pulling all these entities together to get a complete vision for trans for pboro; local priorities AND statewide goals (see benefits of ctp slide)

corridor protection==benjamin pkwy in gboro example slide

strategic highway corridors will come into play in this plan; important corridors go thru this study area (us 64, 15-501). facility type representations consistent throughout document.

facility types as noted in the dot process will be important as we move forward; implications for volumes, multi-modal access/use, driveway permits, signals affected moving forward based on facility

[presented facility types]

we are in the early part of the ctp development process [see slide of same name]. we and dot have been doing background work; collecting data and the like

[noted that we will not solely focus on moving cars, but moving people]

Establish steering committee==will be primary driver and decision maker in terms of goals and objectives; primary level of adoption will be at the Town level. diversity of opinion, range of knowledge important. [gave ex. of bike plan committee stacked with hardcore cyclists]

Land use projections will probably refinement [splitting] of TAZs. Roberto likely to sit down with local staff & developers to get a better vision of the future [to build TAZs that reflect that] coordination will be a big part of this task

early oct steering cmte meeting. gives us time to get data and do forecasts. develop recommendations into early winter. maps first, documentation and report in late December

Any questions?

Philip c: is that last line the website

will: yes.

Bill t: what about this ppt...will that be there

will: yes

john a (Pittsboro place): when is next meeting?

will: next meeting will be staff level...pulling together data, projections, etc.

bill t: possible to reduce slides to gantt chart?

will: yes--current one starts in may, so I have to push it back a bit

randy: will u incorp ped master plan we just passed

will: yes, esp how ped facil affect vehicular cap. of roadways.

tom v: will that help for funding opportunities too?

will: yes; and we want to have the conversation about how the recommendations will affect funding as we go into new cycle [gave examples --sustainable communities, stuff outside the purview of dot--non-trad funding sources)

tom v: will you have sched of pre steering committee meetings? the county has a [large stake] in this, so that our transpo planner can be a participant

will; absolutely...those conversations will begin today...setting dates.

tom v: we [chatham co] is number 2 in the state after moore

scott: it's very good timing actually; [went over what is going on in moore; resolving issues that sunk moore plan 10 years ago first] I see this as a subset of chatham plan in the same way; resolving 15-501 issue in advance of total county plan

tom v: will siler city have a ctp done?

scott: we have to do a model for them, and they are a bit different. we really don't do town plans so much anymore. single, unified plans where everyone is on the same page. [reiterated timing is very good]

randy: who are the official members of committee now

will: it hasn't really been formed

paul h: [pointed out staff/electeds present that form the core of committee]

john a: will you add any citizens [offered to volunteer]

scott: ultimately up to the town. a large committee can become unwieldy; but meetings are open to the public

will: yes, 8-10 members is a good size for a committee [described some past committee experiences, noting that including key members of the public important, but *promotion* by locals, rpo, dot to get participation in the meetings [to get input] is the key to success

tom v: are you willing to have hard copy of public materials at the library for folks who are not online? [noted not all citizens had access]

will: certainly; and there are also people that don't like to go to public meetings-- [described some ways to get their input]

randy: i think it would be helpful to define public in different ways: developers, business owners (that may not live in town), and residents

bill t: in terms of size of steering committee, we'd like to keep it small. there are at least 9 major developers. a committee with all of them would be unwieldy. the committee should be the "stubby pencil" work folks, rolling up their sleeves and slogging through details.

randy: bill--didn't we already proscribe this group?

bill t: we put together the core of the group, but it's still open if there were a need. it's not final

john a: and I wasn't implying that it needed to be big, just that business owners needed to be heard [discussion about how that might be filled...someone from CofC or downtown assn]

will: we will charge the steering committee with reaching out to their constituencies for input.

Mike: you mentioned you be substantially done by the end of the year; does that include everything

will: yes; the maps will definitely be done by then, with the report lagging behind them by a few weeks [noted workloads are less than they have been in the past, so staff availability is good]

mike: pointed out land use plan that we are working on...how do you reconcile that

scott: we predicated this on "updating a thoroughfare plan" so it's not a full blown ctp; you have zoning

mike: so would it matter when we adopt our LUP...would that affect the process?

scott: we hope that the folks that can represent the plan are on the committee [indicated town staff]

tom: and county is also updating LUP...won't be done in time for this, but will affect this process [outlined goal of pushing development in town centers]

will: we really need general ideas to move forward

bill t: so you could work with a draft LUP

will: definitely. it would have to be pretty substantive changes to change "pavement on the road"

david: you're looking at overall densities

will: yes

roberto: we generally are measuring in "number of lanes" which is a pretty gross indicator. It would take a big change to affect

paul b: working with mpo...small changes matter for transit models, but not in play here

randy: how will you incorporate STAC plan?

will: [back to grossness of "lanes" as unit...shouldn't really affect]

roberto: outlines general low % of transit vs. auto and how it affects modeling--not terribly significant outside of places like NY & Chicago. Key indicators (for modeling) are LU, special transit hubs/transit concentrated place, not VMT.

will t: chapel hill data...95 % of citizens never get on a transit bus [discussion]

randy: and we have to plan for the future where the price of petroleum is higher

roberto: and we might want to incorporate things like access to park & ride lots, etc.

scott: mpo will eventually model pboro

paul b: they already do. model bdy goes to almost western edge of etj

philip: [indicating harnett map] talking about where the line on the map will go...we will look at a line on a map at the end of this process, but that's not where the project may necessarily go [noted current bypass alignments under study]

will: we've been asked to drill down a little tighter and try to identify a corridor for study. A "conceptual design" but is really ROW limits [that will still allow flexibility for federal permitting process]

sarah: outreach...internet access is not the only outreach we do

john: one housekeeping issue--can we make sure everyone is apprised of the next meetings and meeting schedule

will: certainly [indicated sign in sheets] we might not grow the steering committee itself, but participation is great. the more input we can get the better, and we'll encourage participation. More than just a report...education [about the process] and understanding of why [decisions were made].

[thanked everyone for coming. meeting ends]